COLVIN'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

NO. 14.] WASHINGTON CITY, APRIL 16, 1808. [VOL. 1.

THE EMBARGO—*(continued from page 71.)*—After seven years labor the federalists now flatter themselves they have at last found the genuine political philosopher's stone, which is to realize all their golden dreams of power. It is by the embargo they work. That is their addition, their multiplication, their subtraction.—Whatever subject they write upon or speak to, the embargo never fails to make a conspicuous figure in their essays or harangues. The feelings of the fishermen, in a very particular manner, are operated upon by federal quacks, and Cape Cod petitions flow into congress in shoals. If I may be allowed a pun upon so serious a subject, the federal party have at length determined to *scale* the administration; because the government, whatever it has done with the *loaves*, has not taken care enough of the *fishes*.

I had, for my own part, always conceived the embargo to be *an appeal to the patriotism of the nation*. Mr. Dana did, indeed, say on the floor of the house of representatives, that it was no appeal of that kind, and very broadly insinuated that it was a sort of arbitrary law which cunning gentlemen had the right to pick as many holes in as they possibly could. I really cannot conceive what the Connecticut orator would interpret into an *appeal to patriotism*. Surely when the national rights are invaded and the national sovereignty insulted, any measure going to vindicate them or to prevent the recurrence of the wrong, ought to be viewed in that light. But it is necessary for men like Mr. Dana to maintain such doctrine in order to give consistency to their conduct in so continually brawling at the embargo as a measure calculated to reduce the people (and the fishermen in particular) to a state of ruin, beggary, and even, as Mr. Quincey gravely remarked of the Providence Town and Truro men, who catch more fish than they can sell, and of course *more than they can eat*, to a state of *starvation*.

Whether the embargo be an appeal to the patriotism of the nation or not, it will be allowed by candid men that it is an act which the perilous and unparalleled crisis of these singular times most imperiously demanded; and in that point of view, if in no other, the friends of the country ought to support it.

There is no doubt but various classes in society feel very severely the effects of the embargo law. But what do we feel, in comparison, to that which is inflicted on the miserable subjects of European monarchies? Look to Great Britain herself, that boasted nation, with which federalists tell us we ought by all means to unite, with her *million of paupers*—to France, to all Germany, to Holland, Spain, Portugal, and Italy—what scenes of blood, what abject poverty, what wretchedness and distress have they not been and are still subjected to! And do *we* complain! Do we shrink from the evils of an *Embargo*? *We*, who have boasted of the feats of our fathers, of the glory of our arms, of the independence of our minds, of the fortitude of our courage, and the noble daring of our dispositions? Yet the men who make such an outcry would fight Bonaparte! *They* fight Bonaparte? All a joke. They cannot bear a single privation: They,

groan if you deprive them of a dainty, and are ready to *run riot* if you do but prevent them from warming their toes when the frost pinches. Such is not the patriotism of New England as recorded by Gordon, and Ramsay, and Warren, and Marshall.

The federalists of Massachusetts and Connecticut are a living satire on their forefathers. The old revolution men would not submit to impositions when they were subjects of George the third and these states colonies of Great Britain. But our federalists, who boast of their spirit, and their understandings; and, indeed, I know not what of peculiar perfections, now that we are independent, are quite willing that Great Britain should dishonor and injure us just when and where she pleases: Nay, perfectly satisfied, and even desirous, that we should buy licenses from the British government for carrying on trade; which licenses, like the rescripts of the captain of a gang of robbers to individuals of his party, commands the English ships of war and privateers, pickaroons and buccaneers, to suffer us to pass free of molestation, as it was his majesty's sovereign will and pleasure that we (having paid for the same sixty guineas) should sail under the protection of his royal pass, like a negro with a holiday furlough from his master.

But is it the fact that the fishermen suffer, in the aggregate, more than other classes of the people? In a letter from the secretary of the treasury of the 27th of February, 1808, the following specification is given of the articles of domestic growth or manufacture, exported from the U. States for the year prior to the first day of October 1807:

Produce of the Sea, *(fish)*	$2,804,000
Forest,	5,476,000
Agriculture,	37,832,000
Manufactures,	2,409,000
Uncertain,	179,000
	$48,700,000

Thus out of 48,700,000 dollars worth of domestic produce and manufactures exported from this country in one year, only 2,804,000 dollars worth are the product of the sea; a sum which is but very little more than that which the exports of manufactures amount to: And yet we hear no clamors from the manufacturers; nor are the agriculturalists up in arms, although they are deprived of a vent for near forty millions of dollars worth.

Mr. Key admitted in debate, that the aggregate amount of fish precluded from exportation by the embargo, did not much exceed 1,200,000 dollars. He spoke particularly of the *codfish*; the *whales* he observed he should not meddle with; (the whales are much obliged to him.) And for this sum he would take off the embargo. Mr. George W. Campbell very properly remarked, that if the fishermen's necessities were so extremely severe, it would be better to provide for them pecuniary relief, than by immediately taking off the embargo, expose the whole nation to the greatest evils.

Let us see how the affair stands as it relates to states. I will select five of the leading commercial states for an example:

The value of exports is, from

	Domestic.	*Foreign.*	*Total.*
Massachusetts,	6,185,748	13,926,377	20,112,125
New York,	9,957,416	16,400,547	26,357,963
Pennsylvania,	4,809,616	12,055,128	16,864,744

Domestic.	*Foreign.*	*Total.*
Maryland,		
4,016,699	10,282,285	14,298,984
South Carolina,		
7,129,365	3,783,199	10,912,564

Thus we find that Massachusetts is not so great a sufferer as New York; and in proportion to her commercial character less so than Pennsylvania, Maryland and South Carolina; the latter of which, dealing extensively in cotton, could, if the embargo were raised, have no market for that article except by paying tribute to G. Britain; and, as Mr. David R. Williams very judiciously remarked, assisting her to defray the expences of her wars.

Take New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, and the whole of their exports are not more in proportion to the whole export trade of the union, than the proportion which they (being four states) bear to the seventeen United States.

Why, then, should they complain more than other parts of the Union? Their fish will keep as well as flour; and, if Mr. Key's story of the perishable nature of flour be correct, much better.

We are told, however, that the "poor fishermen" are by the embargo deprived of their *all;* and Mr. Quincey, in a random calculation, informed the house of representatives that by the deprivation of a market for their fish, each man experiences a loss of at least 400 dollars per annum, which the calculatior stated to be the total sum of each poor fisherman's income. This mode of counting a man's loss goes upon the presumption that those who experience the privation are to sit down, fold their arms, and do nothing for a livelihood, because they cannot go to Europe as usual with their fish. Suppose the manufacturers were to use the same logic; and those who are the actual tillers of the soil, and sufferers by the temporary decrease of agriculture occasioned by the embargo, were to cry aloud that they too are ruined—deprived of their all; would not their story be quite as plausible as that which federalists advance with such vehemence on behalf of the fishermen? And yet from the agriculturalists and manufacturers we hear no outcry.

For what purpose are communities of men and governments instituted? Surely for mutual defence and general welfare. And if that defence and that welfare require a momentary privation of benefits previously enjoyed, it is nothing more than a part of the price which each individual, by remaining in that society and partaking of its advantages, pays for the enjoyments of his situation in happier times. But the poor man is afflicted more than the rich. Do the noisy declaimers mean to say that this distinction is made by the law laying the embargo? Rather let them recollect that poverty, in any possible situation of life, is subjected to greater disadvantages than wealth.

Why are the fishermen to starve because they cannot export the surplus of their commodity? I really should presume that starvation is out of the question where an article so eatable as fish is abundantly plentiful. And can they not exchange a sufficient quantity of the product of the sea for flour in order to supply the calls of their necessities for the latter article? It does not follow, that because they cannot export they cannot catch fish at all. Certainly the poor fishes are not embargoed.

The farmer feels the weight of the embargo; so does the merchant, the mechanic, the daily laborer: All

classes feel it. It is a general calamity; not equal, however, to war; nor half so oppressive as those burthens under which the rest of the world groans. Nor is it an evil that we have brought upon ourselves, nor one which the government willingly continues. But we have been compelled to resort to it by events unprecedented in the annals of the world, and which no possible conduct on the part of administration can control.

Mr. Randolph, joining in the general federal outcry, rails with all his virility at the embargo, and pronounces it the greatest curse that ever the country labored under. But we all know Mr. Randolph's object. He wants to pull down the administration: He has sworn to destroy it.—The miseries occasioned by the embargo he believes to be the best chord to play upon in order to attain that object. He knows the people *feel* the pressure of that act, and he strives to enlist their *feelings* against the government. But he ought to recollect that the citizens of this country *reason* as well as feel; and that they, themselves, by their own expressed voice, called for measures much stronger than the embargo before that law was resorted to. But why is that act a *curse?* Is it a curse to preserve our ships, to secure our seamen, to place our merchandize in safety?—What would he wish, supposing him to be in earnest? Would he have war? Not if you will believe him; for he ridicules the idea of danger from foreign powers. He says we are safe, and snug, and free from harm. Is it further negociation that he desires? Does he wish to bring another minister into disgrace? Or to have another Monroe treaty? With France he is heretical; and with England perfectly orthodox. Shall we send another extraordinary minister to St. James, to dance attendance on equivocating British ministers; and like his friend, "to attend Mr. Canning in the country should it be more agreeable to Mr. Canning to receive him there?"

Mr. Randolph, following in the wake of Mr. Quincey, did not fail to bait his book for popularity with the federal fishes. He hoped they would be given to the soldiery for a lent diet. The expression reminded me very forcibly of an argument used by a ministerial writer in Great Britain, who attempted to defend the English orders of council of November 11th, on the ground that they would be in force precisely in time to prevent the Roman Catholic countries under Bonaparte's control from being supplied with fish for their lent season. How then, as Mr. Burwell demanded of Mr. Quincey, could these poor fishermen have found purchasers for the product of their labor whilst the British make it a point to prohibit their going to the great markets where they can sell it? I am very much of opinion that the gentlemen's *codfish* will turn out a mere *gudgeon*.

It was undoubtedly a curious and rather venturesome assertion in the formal orator (Mr. Randolph) when on Monday last he boldly proclaimed in the representative hall, that the necessity for the embargo grew out of the misconduct of our own government. And how did he prove it? Why, Sir, he said that we ought to have renewed Jay's treaty, and what is infinitely worse, adopted Monroe's treaty; and then (quoth he) the British would not have harassed your trade. Most excellent logician! I grant him all he says in that way. Assuredly if we had yielded implicity to British terms they would hardly have used us so unkindly as to interdict our trade afterwards. There would have been no

occasion for it. They would have had it already settled to their liking; every thing in black and white; and we should have returned to our old state of vassalage and obedience. They would not, indeed, have had colonial assemblies here; but then they would have had what suited them a great deal better: They would have had their friends and advocates in congress; their Pickerings and Randolphs—their Elys and Hillhouses—their Quinceys and Danas—and a few others, to represent them obliquely. Things no doubt would have gone on swimmingly; we should have had no rant about codfish, and fewer tiresome partizan speeches in congress calculated for the people out of doors. Yes, indeed; had we thrown ourselves into the arms of Great Britain, or humbly bowed obsequiously at her feet and begged a pitiful treaty from the hand that scourged us, she would hardly, I do believe, have been so cruel, so unkind, as to torture us with her insulting orders afterwards. And yet even for that we had no security; for after the treaty was framed, they would not subscribe it unless (good, honest, candid souls!) they were permitted to break it at their pleapure!

The embargo a curse! the treaty a blessing! I hope the freemen of this country now perfectly understand Mr. Randolph. He is the advocate of Great Britain and the accuser of his own country. He really deserves a pension, with the insertion of his name—not in Bonaparte's bulletin of the legion of honor—but in that famous *red book*, which the honest and independent Frank Burdett told the English people was the muster roll of corruption.

The argument against a non-resistance to Great Britain, because she will not yield particular points and because she is all powerful on the ocean, is one of those curious positions which go to the total enslavement of a nation. It is what Cobbett contends for when he says that not a single ship ought to be suffered to navigate the ocean without the permission of Great Britain. Bonaparte has used the same mode of argument in his subjugation of the European continent. Behold my armies, he has said; I am all powerful; what is the use of your resistance; yield to me and I will protect you. This logic has some sense in it when it is applied to the kingdoms of Europe, which lie open and contiguous to France: But surely it is devoid of weight when it is advanced in allusion to this country and England. We are a people, a continent by ourselves; and although a resistance to foreign oppressions may deprive us of many conveniences and advantages, it can never reduce us to a state of absolute suffering. We can in any great political emergency live within ourselves. What I mean by *living*, is the plentiful supply of bread, butter, poultry, beef, pork, fish, and wholesome liquors. As long as we have these articles of sustenance, we may, if we divest ourselves of extraneous desires, no ways necessary to be gratified to make us happy, live comfortably for a series of years without any particular intercourse with any foreign power whatever.

Mr. Randolph and his colleagues argue against the embargo, and in favor of submission to British policy, as if this was the last generation that is to inhabit this country. Do we owe nothing to posterity? Does the father feel nothing for the future wel-

fare of his children? Will he suffer nothing for those who are to come after him? As the principle of human life is perpetuated by reproduction, so is the welfare of a nation continued by the unceasing efforts of the community which constitute it. If myriads of human beings are swept off by plague, famine, or war, that is no reason why the progress of society should not go on: And if, in our endeavors to maintain the interests of the nation, we are doomed to suffer pressing evils, such as on our part are unavoidable, are we for that cause to whine and yield to the pressure, to humiliate the manhood, to humble the dignified pride, the natural and precious feelings of our nature?—What are the little benefits of a *day*, to the advantages to be reaped in the lapse of ages? And yet it is on the petty profits, lost by a temporary measure, of a year, perhaps of less duration, that Mr. Randolph and his fellow logicians bottom their outcry against the embargo. Is national honor worth preserving? Are national interests deserving of a struggle for their maintenance? And can an empire live and flourish without the vindication of its rights? Slaves may, indeed, negociate for a preference of degrees in degradation: They may choose between the number of stripes, and find an apology in their servile condition: But to *freemen*; to freemen too, who for upwards of thirty years have spoken, and written and printed volumes upon volumes of eulogium on their free and independent spirit, there is no alternative from dishonorable and vile submission, but manly resistance or a glorious death.

The embargo, however, is said to be unconstitutional! A new and wonderful discovery of Mr. John Randolph, in this enlightened nineteenth century. And, strange to tell, that so grave and pensive a senator should forestall his better judgment, this same Mr. Randolph scrambled for the honor of being the *first* to offer a resolution for an embargo! He did, indeed, attempt to creep out of the *inconsistency* by pleading an indiscreet haste in the first instance, and making a sorrowful confession for the misdeed. For my own part, I cannot see how any man can trust Mr. Randolph after this acknowledgement; for if he is subject to such thoughtless acts, and liable to overlook his judgment in one particular, what surety have we that his political speed may not, on most occasions, outrun his understanding? I will examine, for a moment, the question of constitutionality, and, ascertain how far Mr. Randolph's doctrine is correct.

In the course of an evening's reading I have looked into the constitution of the United States; and I find at the commencement of it, the following declaratory clause:

"We the people of the U. States, "in order to form a more perfect u-"nion, establish justice, insure do-"mestic tranquility, provide for the "common defence, promote the ge-"neral welfare, and secure the bles-"sings of liberty to ourselves and "our posterity, do ordain and esta-"blish this constitution."

In the eighth section of the first article I find that

"The congress shall have power to "provide for the common defence "and general welfare of the United "States."

And farther on, in the same section of the same article, after the enumeration of a variety of subjects on which they may act, it is declared that

"Congress shall have power to

" make all laws which shall be neces-
" sary and proper for carrying into
" execution the foregoing powers,
" and all other powers vested by this
" constitution in the government of
" the United States, or in any de-
" partment or officer thereof."

Now, as I understand the constitution, there can be no dispute about the power of congress *to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States:* The only possible question that can arise in the case is this: Is the measure calculated for *common defence*, or will it serve to promote the *general welfare?* All measures, professedly with that object in view, are matters of *opinion*, and of which the government, constituted for the especial purpose, is the judge. The judgment of the government may be defective; but that does not prove they have not the power.

Every member of the government is *sworn* to support the constitution, which, we find, declares that congress *shall* have power *to provide for the common defence and general welfare.* Were, then, our ships, seamen and merchandize, *in want of defence,* and did the *general welfare* require that they should be defended?

Let us recur to opposition logic.

Take off your embargo, says Mr. Masters, and *arm* your ships:

Take off your embargo, and *arm* your merchantmen, says Mr. Quincey:

Mr. Key pipes his tune to the same notes:

Mr. Randolph argues to the same point.

If, as these gentlemen say, it is necessary to *arm* our vessels in pursuing their traffic, there must be a *necessity* for *defending* them: And the question forcibly presents itself—

Is the *arming of merchant ships* sufficient to protect them from capture?

The question is answered by universal experience. No merchant vessel is a match for even a common privateer that is properly manned: And although British merchantmen all go armed, they generally *sail under convoy of ships of war.*

It then follows that *arming* our vessels will not protect them. But a *navy* would.

The reply to the suggestion of a navy is decisive. We cannot build an *efficient* one, and it would be worse than foolish to build one that would be *inefficient.*

There was no way, therefore, to provide for the *common defence* and the *general welfare*, as it respects our commerce, but by an *embargo.*

Does the embargo protect our seamen, our ships, and our merchandize?

It certainly keeps them in our ports and towns, and as far *out of the reach* of the belligerents as we can place them: and where, if they come to molest them, we can defend them more effectually than we could on the sea.

Thus, then, the embargo is a measure of *common defence*—a provision for the *general welfare.* And as to the correctness of the opinion that it is calculated for those purposes, we have the voice of the president, of the heads of departments, of a majority of congress, of a majority of the state legislatures, and of a majority of the people at large.

Let me proceed a little further on this topic:

" Congress *shall have power* (says
" the constitution imperatively) to
" make *all laws* which shall be *neces-*
" *sary* and *proper* for carrying into

" execution the foregoing powers." Aye, says Mr. Randolph, but—(your *but* is an excellent sophist)—the " foregoing powers" give congress no *explicit* authority to lay an embargo! I grant it. The same clause says, however, that congress shall not only have power, " to make all " laws which shall be necessary and " proper for carrying into execution " the *foregoing* powers;" but likewise that congress shall have power " to make all laws which shall be *ne-* " *cessary* and *proper* for carrying in- " to execution all *other powers* vest- " ed by this constitution in the go- " vernment of the United States."

Now let me ask, " what *other pow-* " *ers* are vested by the constitution " in the *government* of the United " States?" Not in the judiciary; not in the legislature: not in the executive, separately; but in the *government?* Surely all those powers which although not specified, and not prohibited, grow, *ex necessitate rei*, out of the constitution itself, and without the exercise of which, the government could not be carried on and the whole would be a mere dead letter.

Will Mr. Randolph say that the phrase " *vested by this constitution*" must be understood as meaning *specifically laid down?* Then I beg him to tell me (for he is really an ingenious man!) how he will reconcile with such a construction the expressions, " vested by this constitution in the government of the United States, or in any *department* or *officer* thereof," when the fact is that the whole duty of even the president is not prescribed in that instrument, and that the several *departments* and *officers* of the government exercise powers which are not hinted at in the most distant manner in any of the sections or articles of the national compact?

Let me offer a single example: I could quote fifty:

" The president may require the " opinion, in writing, of the princi- " pal officer in each of the executive " departments." Yet there are no officers of executive departments, except the president, mentioned through out the whole constitution.

It was with some degree of surprize that I heard Mr. Key in the house of representatives, get up and so far depart from his usual cunning as to assert that he could prove that the embargo prohibited the exportation of at least thirty-eight millions of dollars worth of domestic produce which the French could not prevent, and which the British orders of council did not affect; and in his calculation he said he left out all Europe; by which I presume he meant continental Europe. I know Mr. Key too well to be the dupe of his plausibility, however it may be varnished over with select words and a theatrical tone.—The speech which he pronounced was evidently a prepared, a studied one; or what, in common parlance we call a *set speech;* that is, a *dead set* at the embargo, and a *hard push* for *popularity*. As, then, it is a speech by preparation and study, he will not be able to get over any errors that it may contain, as did his very honorable and right cunning friend John Randolph, in the case of his first moving a resolution for an embargo and then condemning an embargo, by alledging that he acted too precipitately. I proceed to shew that if Mr. Key was in earnest, he does not understand the subject; and if he was not in earnest, he is—*what I do not choose to name.*

Mr. Key founds his assertion on the following data:

During the year ending on the 30th of September, 1807, there was exported (according to official docu-

ments) from the United States of domestic produce and manufactures, as follows:

To Sweden and her dependencies,	$ 472,666
To G. Britain and her dependencies,	27,917,077
To Portugueze colonies,	570,303
To Turkey, Levant, and Egypt,	4,520
To Morocco and Barbary states,	8,358
To China,	84,022
To E. Indies, generally,	317,163
To W. Indies, generally,	1,126,279
To Africa,	369,924
To South Seas,	3,385
To N. W. coast of America,	10,777
	$ 30,884,474

These are all the dominions to which Mr. Key, by his own expressions, could reasonably mean we had a privilege of trade under British orders, and from which the French decrees could not inhibit us. He did not particularize, for fear, I suppose of detection. He was very careful, on the contrary, to avoid particulars. I allow him, however, the widest latitude; so that his admirers will have no possible room to cavil.

It appears, then, that on his own ground, his estimate falls short about seven millions of dollars. A trifle to be sure, for a dashing politician, who deals in fiction; but to a man who adheres to plain, rugged truth, a pretty smart sum.

It is true, Mr. Key, after Mr. D. R. Williams pressed him on the point, came out with a confused and very unintelligible discrimination of countries to which we can trade; and included among them the whole West India colonies of all the European powers, under the pretext that the British orders do not prohibit an intercourse with them. —Let us refer to the orders themselves; which, I presume, are authority equal to Mr. Key's assertion.

Extract from the British orders of council of November 11, 1807.

"All the ports and places of "France and her allies, or of any "other country at war with his ma- "jesty, and all other ports or places "in Europe, from which, though not "at war with his majesty, the British "flag is excluded, and *all other ports* "*or places in the* COLONIES *belonging* "*to his majesty's enemies shall from* "*henceforth be subject to the same re-* "*strictions in point of trade and na-* "*vigation as if the same were actu-* "*ally blockaded by his majesty's for-* "*ces, in the most* STRICT *and* RIGOR- "OUS *manner.*" "And that *every* "*vessel* trading from or *to* the said "countries or *colonies*, together with "*all goods* and *merchandize on board*, "SHALL be CAPTURED and CON- "DEMNED AS PRIZE to the cap- "tors."

There then follows an exception to this part of the order, which exonerates from its provisions all vessels of friendly neutral powers going directly from their own or British free ports to and from French and other colonies: But which exception is by another provision in the same order, rendered totally nugatory, by subjecting to capture all vessels having consular certificates of origin from the enemies of Great Britain, and with which certificates neutrals are obliged to be supplied in order to carry on their trade with those enemies. So that, by the very terms of the British order, every vessel proceeding to ports hostile to England are liable to condemnation: And the argument that we can enjoy a free trade to the

West Indies at large, is false and unfounded in fact; and therefore not to be included in the estimate of those places to which we can have access.

This circumstance, however, is of very little consequence to my exposition of the case; for I am going to demonstrate a very important fact, which totally overthrows Mr. Key's whole system of argument.

[illegible] incontestible position, that with the produce which the Americans export to the dominions specified in the foregoing statement, goods are purchased in those dominions, which are brought to this country, for which a market can be found no where else but in those ports and places that are under French control andfrom which we are excluded by their decrees: And further, that the produce of the U. States is exported only in proportion to the market which we can obtain for those foreign manufactures and produce which we take in exchange for our own.

I now solicit the reader to follow me in a concise examination of the current of our foreign trade, as exhibited in the subjoined statement, which I have, with some labor, extracted from official printed documents, in the hands of every member of congress, and accessible to any man who wishes more particularly to satisfy himself of the truth of what I advance.

It appears from the data on which Mr. Key founds his calculations, that we usually export to England, Man, and Berwick, Scotland, Ireland, Guernsey, Jersey, Sark, and Alderny, Gibraltar, British African ports, British East Indies, British West Indies, Newfoundland and British fisheries, and to the British American colonies 27,917,077 dollars worth of domestic produce. Recurring to the secretary of the treasury's report to Congress of the date of January 30th, 1808, wherein he states the amount of goods, wares and merchandize imported *into* the U. States from foreign countries. I find the following specification of the amount in value of articles (I speak only of such as pay duties *ad valorem*, without including the other merchandize) brought into this country from places respectively prefixed:

England, Man and Berwick,	$32,309,856
Scotland,	2,148,014
Ireland,	1,064,879
Gibraltar,	8,428
British African ports,	10,279
British East Indies,	3,559,382
British West Indies	85,399
British American colonies	238,311
	$39,424,748

Now these are the same places (indeed not quite so many) as those to which we exported our domestic produce to the amount of 27,917,000 dollars. Let me exhibit the difference.

Imported from British possessions,	$39,000,000
Exported to them,	27,917,000
Leaving against us a balance of	$11,083,000

Of the vast mass of any foreign goods brought into this country, we send few to the British possessions. For instance, to the ports above recited we do not send above 3,000,000 of dollars worth. Where then do we find a market for them? Take the following for an answer:

Abstract of the amount of foreign goods exported from the U. States to foreign countries, in one year, to wit:

To Holland,	$13,086,160
To France and her colonies,	13,433,685
To Spain and her colonies	14,226,145
	$ 40,745,990

This statement is also from a public official document. I could have extended it, but I conceive this is quite sufficient. It proves incontestibly that Holland, France and Spain, were the three great markets for foreign goods exported from this country; which goods the statements preceding show were principally imported from British possessions, and paid for in our own produce. Let me offer another short statement:

The total amount of goods paying duties *ad valorem* imported into the United States is (to speak in round numbers) about	$ 54,000,000
Of these we get from British possessions, about,	40,000,000
And from all the world besides!	$ 14,000,000

Thus it is: We export to British possessions vast quantities of produce, for which we get British manufactures; which manufactures, after deducting the necessary supply for our own consumption, we carry to Holland, France, Spain, and other places, and are enabled to realize a profit on our own products by this circuitous traffic, which enriches our citizens, besides enabling us to pay that balance against us in favor of Great Britain which is manifested in one of the preceding statements.

Now is it not evident, that if by the exclusive restrictions of France, Spain, and Holland, we are prohibited from going thither with the goods which we get in exchange for our domestic produce, the foreign articles would remain on our hands? And is it likely, that our merchants would, even if they were able enough, continue to export such vast quantities of articles of domestic growth and manufacture, when they would be involving themselves in debt, and could not realize a profit by the sale of British merchandize at the usual markets?

But I can tell Mr. Key and my readers another fact, in which no respectable commercial man will contradict me.

A great quantity of the domestic produce annually shipped to the dominions of Great Britain, is only nominally so; for although it is thus put down upon the registry of our exports, yet in truth it is shipped *to a market:* As, for instance, a vessel clears out for Cowes and a market; she only touches at Cowes, where she receives the orders of the British consignee, (who, in this case, is only an agent,) and proceeds by his directions to some port on the European continent. So that in reality, the exportation of our domestic produce and manufactures depends, not on the purchases of British subjects, but in a great measure upon the freedom and extent of the market for our own and *British merchandize* in France, Spain, Holland, and other countries. And as the French and their allies have absolutely prohibited us from intercourse with them in the productions of G. Britain, if the embargo were taken off to-morrow, the exportation of our own produce, in proportion to what it has been, would be a mere cypher.

Thus far I have argued the case on the admission that France and her al

lies cannot interrupt the trade of the United States. But woeful experience proves that the case is far otherwise. I will ask the opposition, and the federal part of it in particular, whence they derive the grounds of their outcry against France for her spoliations of our commerce? We do not meet with a solitary federal print that does not contain many clamorous paragraphs concerning her seizure of our ships, the maltreatment of our seamen, nay the very burning of our merchantmen? Are they willing to admit that they have been raising a rude uproar without color or cause? Why did the Essex Junto at the late election in Massachusetts promulgate their handbills, with the picture of American vessels in flames, charging the outrage upon France? Were these not instances of interruption of our commerce by France? Or are the federalists prepared to acknowledge that they are the propagators of unfounded tales to answer electioneering purposes?

But if they were *armed!* Well; if they were? Let us look to the British themselves, with all their naval force. Under the head of "Calcutta, Oct. 21," I find the following article:

"It is ascertained that in the short space of eight days, not less than ten valuable ships have fallen into the hands of the Piedmontaise, [French frigate] have been manned by the captors, and sent to the Mauritius: And it is to be dreaded, that the catalogue of captures, numerous as it already is, will be still further enlarged by the activity of the enemy's cruisers."

These ten ships were all Indiamen, heavily armed, and of immense value. At the very moment of their capture a British naval force was stationed in the Indian seas for the special protection of their trade.

Look to the account from the Mediterranean sea; to the American vessels sent into Leghorn, and other ports on the Italian coast, by French cruisers; to the vessels seized on their passages from England by the same; to the captures made by them in the Caribbean sea; and then let Mr. Key stand forth and justify the correctness of his assertion to the nation.

Was it not a rational policy, after we had reaped the harvest of a successful commerce of fifteen years neutrality, that when the foul tempest of European outrage came upon us, we should secure it? Does the husbandman after he has gathered his crop, leave it exposed to the depredations of hungry beasts, or to be purloined by every passing spoiler? Our industry was the seed, our seamen, ships, and merchandize the fruits, and the embargo is the granary by which they are protected from destruction.

It is as necessary to belligerents that there should be neutrals, as it is interesting to neutrals that their rights should be respected. God himself has not appropriated the ocean to local uses; but by its nature disposed it to general purposes. Why then should men, usurping a petty "brief authority," attempt to pervert it? A little good sense, a little patience, and a few efforts on our part, will make the warring powers of the world *feel* the loss of our friendship—a loss occasioned by their own presumptuous folly. If we resolutely proceed in laying the foundations of manufactures, a few years will put the manufacturer in the neighborhood of the agriculturalist; and instead of paying a balance of many millions to G. Britain, we shall embosom those milli-

ons among our own citizens, and in time lay the inhabitants of the globe under contribution to our industry. The follies of England will be the aggrandizement of America. She has kept Europe at war just long enough to give us stamina for a gigantic growth. In 1783 we wanted capital: In 1808 we have got it. The crude materials are within our reach, the digestive *momentum* is within us; a little exercise, and a wholesome diet, will diffuse through every vein and artery of our system a potent vigor, till the aspect of our country glows with a lusty and lasting prosperity.

The taking off the embargo includes the idea of an *armed trade*. I have heard of an armed neutrality; but as to fighting our way in the face of all the world, I conceive it to be a scheme perfectly Laputan. What does it involve? War: Open, professed, actual war. If our merchant vessels are captured, government must interfere; for if the government should not interfere our commercial relations would assume a buccaneering cast; a perfect Barbary system. But the government *would* have to interfere; and exhibit the spectacle of permitting a small portion of the community to plunge the majority into a state of warfare contrary to their inclinations. Besides, what kind of government can that be called which relinquishes the prerogative of protection to the citizens at large? Is it not virtually dissolving all government? Is it not anarchy? Let every man follow his own bent, and what a ridiculous state of society should we have: A perfect Utopia indeed; for which it is not quite so consistent in federalists to contend, when we consider how they have accused the republican party with the offence of falling into that error.

Would not foreign governments be very apt to treat our merchants as pirates if they proceeded on their own responsibility? Would they not say, you have withdrawn yourselves from the protection of your government; and we shall deal with you as men without a local habitation or a name? It would require very little ingenuity to prove the question affirmatively.

It may not be improper to inform the reader that the subject of the embargo has been brought once more thus fully before the public by a resolution offered in the house of representatives by Mr. G. W. Campbell to empower the president, in the recess of congress, to suspend the operation of the laws imposing it, in case events in his judgment should justify it.—The discussions on this subject were animated and diffusive. The whole range of our foreign relations have been involved in the debate, and Monroe's treaty partially canvassed. The speeches of different gentlemen on the occasion will, I presume, find their way to the people in due time. I merely wish to notice briefly two points that were assumed by the opposition.

The first is, that the embargo will not decide the dispute between this country and Great Britain.

On this topic there has been a misapprehension of the case. The decision of our dispute does not rest with ourselves. It depends on the decision of the war now raging between England and France: And the embargo was not intended to decide our differences with the former, but to keep our citizens and property from the rapacious gripe of both. If by that measure of security they should feel any inconvenience, it will be so much the better for us.

The second point is, the complaint which Mr. John Randolph made of

"bitter and nipping personalities." No one can be more deeply impressed with the necessity for the strictest decorum in the deliberations of a legislative assembly, than I am; or indeed with the propriety of observing the same decorum in all publications from the press. I shall always maintain, however, that *ridicule* is a lawful weapon in speech or in print; and that ludicrousness of person, grimace of action, and flimsiness of discourse are lawful game. In a truly great man we overlook a thousand deficiencies on account of the excellency of his intellect. But when little minds pertly assume consequential airs, and endeavor to attract respect and admiration by putting on a majestic port, I profess, before Heaven, I cannot restrain my laughter, nor bow in reverence of such fantastical assumptions of dignity. I am not one of those who believe, that "*A saint in crape is twice a saint in lawn*," for men are not like *figures*, to be estimated according to their *place*; but like *metal*, to be valued for their *intrinsic qualities*.

But unquestionably it comes with an inconsistent grace from Mr. Randolph, to complain of *personalities*. If I mistake not, he was the very person who first introduced into congress things of that kind: Certainly the first under the present administration.

Has he forgot the "*hornbook politicians?*" "*Sloan's vegetable specific?*" The "*cock-boat?*" And the thousand contemptuous expressions he has from time to time uttered? Nay; in the very act of reprobating personalities, did he not accuse gentlemen with *want of capacity*, and tell them that they were *beneath his notice?*

I do not see, for my own part, why one man is to be tolerated, whilst another is to be condemned. The law of arms does not ordain that when your antagonist presents a pistol to your breast, you should oppose him with a straw. It is, I presume, in the power of Mr. Randolph to prevent personal allusions by desisting from them himself. He says, indeed, that such things do not provoke his resentment: But the fierceness of his reprobation too strongly marks his wounded spirit, for such declarations to deceive.

AMERICA AND GREAT BRITAIN. (*continued from page* 207.)—I had seriously intended to devote a great portion of this number of the Register to a continuation of my scrutiny of Monroe's treaty. That intention was interrupted by an effort which I found was making against the embargo; and I stopped short, determined at once to meet the opponents of that wise and salutary measure full in the face, and endeavor to prevent the evil effects which they had unquestionably designed to produce. In the foregoing pages will be found a variety of remarks on that subject which, I trust, will be deemed well worthy the perusal.

But this only produces an interval, and not a suspension in my strictures on colonel Monroe's treaty; which, since the high ground taken in behalf of it by Mr. Randolph, in congress, it has become more necesary than ever to probe to the very marrow. I have every desire to treat the colonel in the most courteous manner, and I hope I shall not be accused of treating him in any other way. But I trust I shall be excused if, in the investigation of a subject of such vast importance, I should now and then manifest a degree of severity on his diplomatic conduct whilst minister at

the court of St. James. For the man I certainly feel every proper respect and veneration; but for the politician, he must pass through that crucible into which he has precipitated himself by his vindicatory letter.

On the subject of the East India article, which I canvassed very minutely in my last number, Mr. Randolph, with all his intrepidity and ingenuity, was obliged to acknowledge that it was worse than we had a right to expect. And now I promise him, and all the advocates of that treaty, to demonstrate, as clearly and as fully as I have in the case of the East India article, that on every leading point which the treaty embraces, the provisions are such as we could not accept without deserving the contempt of the world, and could not ratify without most deeply injuring the prime interests of the nation.

I know not what Mr. Randolph's course of study has been; but assuredly he is not profoundly versed in geography, history, or mathematics. If he was, he would not so often miss a figure in his political calculations. The fervor of his genius —a genius, as Paine says of Burke, without a constitution--may have hurried him into a defence of col. Monroe's treaty; but the whole united force of his intellect will not enable him to escape from the odium which the defenders of that unfortunate instrument will draw down upon themselves.

These are times when it becomes every good man to rally round the legitimate standard of the republic.—The old opposition have done and are doing every thing to render the most necessary laws unpopular, and to excite among the citizens a spirit of sedition and revolt; and the new opponents of the administration have likewise put their shoulders to the wheel (without the aid, I hope, of Hercules) and strain with all their strength to give the sound policy of Mr. Jefferson a turn. It is the natural good sense, the virtue of the people, which supports the nation in the present exigency; and it is due to them to throw out to them every spark of intelligence which can enlighten their minds and enable them justly to appreciate the motives and actions of those who so strenuously endeavor to make them dissatisfied with their condition, to rouse them to an unjustifiable hostility to their rulers, and to a disgraceful opposition to laws which could have been only enacted from motives originating in a sincere regard to the welfare of the people. What other than a solemn conviction of the necessity of an embargo could have induced the legislature to have recourse to it? A measure which in its most favorable aspect is calculated to excite discontent could not have been resorted to by men who value popularity more than duty. I have no doubt the public will properly estimate their conduct, and eventually do ample justice to their merits; as I also hope they will to the demerits of those who so rancorously revile, denounce, and endeavor to fasten odium upon them.

MISCELLANEOUS.—In the commonwealth of Massachusetts an election for state officers took place on the first Monday in April; and the federalists put their cause to issue on the embargo. As those politicians have made it a question with the people; by an immediate appeal to them at an election; if the good citizens of Massachusetts should decide against them, they ought to give the point up. That the people will decide the ques-

tion in favor of the administration I have not the least doubt: A short time will enable me to prove the thing arithmetically.

I have believed, and do still believe, that the various petitions from the fishermen of Massachusetts have been put in motion by leading federalists; who I am credibly informed, have induced the unsuspecting complainants in many instances to sign them under the impression that they were for other purposes widely different from any thing like an electioneering contrivance. If, instead of giving this direction to the minds of the fishermen, the federalists had seriously set themselves to work to relieve the necessities of that valuable class of men, they would, if I mistake not, have done an act more consonant to the genuine feelings of humanity, and one which would have obtained them more honor in the eyes of the nation at large.

The New York legislature, with a magnanimity and a delicacy which marks their character as truly republican, have adjourned without entering into any declaration of their predilection for any particular presidential candidate. This I regard as a pledge that the friends of the country in that state will not go into any measures which may tend to distract the general interests and attention of the democratic party. Even had they been favorably disposed to Mr. Madison, (and I know he does not want for firm friends among them,) it would have been an unpardonable indelicacy to Mr. Clinton to have come out with an open proclamation of their feelings. The course they have pursued may be considered as really a wise one; and which will exalt the political character of the whole state.

My readers will be pleased to learn that there is a certainty in the city of New York of the success of the republican ticket, notwithstanding the strenuous efforts of the federalists, who in the approaching annual election have collected all their strength for a desperate conflict. May God speed the cause of our good friends there.

It is with infinite and real regret that I record the death of the Hon. JACOB CROWNINSHIELD, late a member of congress from the state of Massachusetts. He departed this life at five o'clock on the morning of Friday last.

Whether we regard the amenity of his disposition, the urbanity of his manners, the extent of his knowledge, the intelligence of his mind, the assiduity of his application to business, or the unvarying tenor of his patriotism, his country will mourn him as a man who was calculated to render the most eminent and durable services to the republic.

Mr. Bacon announced his demise to the House of Representatives in a most solemn and affecting manner: His obsequies were attended to by the members of the national legislature in the most respectful forms, and in a way which evinced that his death has touched them more deeply than the sorrow of thirty days crape. They attended the corpse about one quarter of a mile from this city on its way to his native state. The reader will recollect that Mr. Crowninshield's complaint was a ruptured blood vessel.

Gentlemen who are desirous of subscribing to the *Weekly Register*, are informed that they can be provided with the numbers from the commencement.

Published in F street—Price, $5 per annum, in advance.